



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,676	07/08/2005	Dirk Reissenweber	2923-717	4121
6449 7590 06/10/2009 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER ROLLAND, ALEX A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/10/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,676

Applicant(s)

REISSENWEBER, DIRK

Examiner

ALEX ROLLAND

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29 and 31-46 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-28, 37, 38 and 41-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 29, 31-36, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/09
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 37-38, and 41-46 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims depend from non-elected claims.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 37-38, 41-46 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. This application contains claims 19-28, 37-38, 41-46 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 9/22/08. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Rejection of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in withdrawn in view of claims amendments filed 3/2/09.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 29, 32, 35, 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curiel (US 6164548) in view of US 6270869 to Zeiter et al. Curiel teaches a method for making a metal layer within a resinous plastic layer wherein a coil of aluminum foil is passed through cooperating rolls that emboss the foil (col. 6, lines 16-26) before it enters the extruder and is encapsulated within resinous plastic material (col. 6, lines 30-33). The embossed foil passes through a printing region after embossing and before encapsulation (col.6, lines 25-30). It is the position of the examiner that the printing operation reads on buffer arrangement insofar as the ink deposited by the printing means would buffer the foil from the hot resinous plastic material. Curiel does not teach coating a reinforcement layer only on the lower side of

the aluminum foil. However, Zeiter teaches a laminate film comprising a metal foil surrounded by plastic layers (abstract) wherein PVC (claimed "additional plastic layer") is placed on one side of the metal foil and polyamide (claimed "reinforcement layer") is placed on the other side of the metal foil (col. 4, lines 20-29). PVC has the loosely bonded and detachable by hand property because Applicant's state that this property is desired of the protective layer and the protective layer may be PVC (pg. 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to practice the method taught by Curiel and substitute the plastic layers of Zeiter because Zeiter states that such plastic layers are suitable for coating metal.

Regarding claim 40, the product is an informational article and can contain holograms (claimed "decorative strip").

7. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curiel (US 6164548) and US 6270869 to Zeiter et al in view of Levendusky et al (US 5919517).

Curiel and Zeiter are discussed above but do not teach the upper layer running like a loop in the area of the buffer arrangement. However, Levendusky teaches a method of coating both sides of an aluminum strip with thermoplastic polymers wherein the aluminum strip is curved (claimed "runs like a loop") before the coating step (see Fig. 1, especially the web traveling around elements 14, 16, and 18). The area before the coating step is taken to be a buffer arrangement insofar as tension rollers 14 buffer the

web from becoming too slack or too taut. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of coating aluminum with polymer of Curiel and Levendusky et al and incorporate a curved web and tension rollers of Levendusky et al between the embossing and extruding operations of Curiel because doing so would incorporate another buffering arrangement after embossing and prior to extruding and predictably allow for more control over the aluminum web.

8. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curiel (US 6164548) and US 6270869 to Zeiter et al in view of Jackson (US 3745056). Curiel and Zeiter are discussed above but are silent as to applying either a protective or adhesive varnish to the metal prior to embossing. However, Jackson teaches a method of making a polymer coated metallic strip wherein some form of adhesive material may be coated on both sides of the metal foil (col. 7, lines 38-44). The adhesive material may be a poly-urethane tape (col. 9, lines 38-41), poly-urethane being a known varnish and imparting both adhesive and protective qualities. Additionally, it has been held that disclosure of the steps without indicating specific order is sufficient to make the prima facie case for obviousness, see *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946) (selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of making a polymer coated metallic strip of Curiel and Jackson and apply a poly-urethane tape

prior to embossing because doing so imparts both adhesive and protective qualities to the metal strip.

9. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curiel (US 6164548) and US 6270869 to Zeiter et al in view of US 1856928 to Pannier. Curiel and Zeiter are discussed above but fail to teach the upper layer stopping during the embossing process. However, Pannier teaches a stamping method for embossing a metal sheet (col. 1, lines 1-4) wherein a pair of embossing dies (claimed "upper stamp" and "lower stamp") are used to emboss metal sheets (col. 1, lines 17-28) by bringing the sheet between the dies, operating upon the sheet (claimed "stopped during embossing"), then shifting the sheet (col. 3, lines 59-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the embossed rollers of Curiel and Zeiter with the embossing dies of Pannier because Pannier states that such embossing dies are suitable for embossing metal.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/2/09, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 29-34 under 102(b) and 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of further search and claim amendments.

Conclusion

11. No Claims are allowed. All pending claims are rejected for the reasons set forth above.
12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX ROLLAND whose telephone number is (571)270-5355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571)272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ALEX ROLLAND/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Michael Cleveland/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792